

## **Draft Language Regarding Denial of Accreditation April 2012**

### **Overview of this Report**

This agenda item draft language for the Accreditation Framework and Handbook, regarding the possibility of changing the Commission's policies and processes related to denying accreditation after an accreditation site visit. This agenda item proposes possible procedures for Denial of Accreditation at the initial site visit and continues the discussion about possible processes related to a new policy.

### **Staff Recommendation**

This is an information item. Staff proposes that the COA continue its discussion from the February and March 2012 meetings and continue to shape the development of a definition for inclusion in the Accreditation Framework and Handbook to guide teams and institutions undergoing accreditation. Staff has developed this agenda item based on input from the COA at its March meeting and requests additional direction for an action item in the future.

### **Background**

The COA initially discussed the topic of Denial of Accreditation at its February 2012 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2012-02/2012-02-item-15.pdf>) and revisited the topic at the March 2012 meeting ([http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2012-03/13-Denial\\_of\\_Accreditation\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2012-03/13-Denial_of_Accreditation_FINAL.pdf))

After affirming at the February meeting that the COA believes the Accreditation Handbook needs to be changed to allow teams to recommend denial of accreditation as a result of an accreditation site visit, and subsequently, that the Accreditation Handbook should be changed to allow the COA the ability to deny accreditation to an institution as a result of an accreditation site visit, the March meeting focused on what parameters and processes should be used in exercising this option.

### **Changes to the Accreditation Handbook**

Chapter 8 of the Accreditation Handbook, outlines the Accreditation Decisions Options and Implications. The COA did not make any recommendations for changes to the Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, Accreditation with Major Stipulations, and Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations definitions. However, for the Denial of Accreditation, the COA members discussed the striking of the word "only" in the first sentence and adding an additional paragraph that is discussed below.

#### ***Denial of Accreditation***

The COA would deny accreditation ~~only~~ if an accreditation team, upon conducting a revisit to an institution that received major or probationary stipulations, finds that the stipulations have not been adequately

addressed or remediated, or determines that significant and sufficient progress has not been made towards addressing the stipulations. If an accreditation team finds that: (a) sufficient progress has been made, and/or (b) special circumstances described by the institution justify a delay, the COA may, if requested by the institution, permit an additional period of time for the institution to remedy its severe deficiencies. If the COA votes to deny accreditation, all credential programs must close at the end of the semester or quarter in which the decision has taken place. In addition, the institution's institutional approval ceases to be valid at that time and the institution will no longer be a CTC approved program sponsor.

In addition, COA members suggested alterations to the table General Guidance for Initial Site Visit Team Recommendations, also found in chapter 8.

Common Standards Less than Fully Met		Range of Accreditation Recommendations				Denial of Accreditation  (usually considered only after a revisit)
# Met with Concerns	# Not Met	Accreditation	with Stipulations	with Major Stipulations	with Probationary Stipulations	
0	0	•				
1-2	0	●	●			
1-2	1-2		●	●		
1-2	3-4			●	●	
3-4	0		●	●		
3-4	1-2		●		●	
3-4	3-4			●	●	
3-4	5+				●	●
5+	0-2			●	●	
5+	3+				●	●

### Parameters to be Used in Considering a Team Recommendation of Denial of Accreditation

Four items were suggested by COA members as parameters in determining when a site review team would consider Denial of Accreditation: fabrication of evidence, the severity of weakness in the institution's program(s), blatant disregard of the Committee on Teacher Credentialing policies, and submitting inappropriate credential recommendations. The following language is proposed as possible consideration for inclusion in the Accreditation Handbook, Chapter 8, in the **Denial of Accreditation** section on page 8, just above Operational Implications.

*However, if on an initial site visit, and the review team's findings are more serious than what is defined in the Accreditation with Probationary Stipulation paragraph above, and*

especially if the situation involves malicious misrepresentation of information, either to the team or in submitted documentation, the review team may consider Denial of Accreditation at an initial site visit. Further considerations:

- Should the team find there are significant misrepresentations that were apparently intentionally made to the site visit team and/or in the documents presented to the site visit team
- In using the table General Guidance for Initial Site Visit Team Recommendations, should the institution qualify for the ruling of Probationary Stipulations, but the team feels that candidates and/or students in the K-12 classroom are possibly being harmed or a disservice is being done to them due to the degree to which those standards are not being met
- Should an institution blatantly and systematically disregard the policies and processes of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing regarding program approval, program implementation, and candidate completion, establishing a pattern of disregard.
- Should the team find the institution is routinely credentialing candidates who were clearly not making acceptable progress in the program

Gay Roby 4/13/12 2:58 PM

**Comment:** •(If the only criteria were sheer numbers, the determination would be probationary status, but the degree of harm makes the determination denial)

Gay Roby 4/13/12 2:58 PM

**Comment:** (This was in regards to Bard's recent behavior)

Additionally, two changes to the Operational Implications on page 8 were made:

- Second bullet: add the phrase "whichever is soonest" at the end
- Third bullet: change the number from 90 to 30 days

### Procedures to Be Used in Determining a COA Decision of Denial of Accreditation

The following items were suggested by COA members as parameters in determining the accreditation decision of Denial of Accreditation:

- For the COA to consider a determination of Denial of Accreditation, it would require a 2/3 majority vote (it was not decided if this would be of the entire membership OR of the members at that particular meeting).  
If such a majority is not reached the determination must be Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations
- In determining a decision of Denial of Accreditation after an initial site visit, the following protocol will be followed:
  - The COA takes action at a regularly scheduled meeting (via a 2/3 vote) to deny accreditation.
  - This decision triggers an automatic stay of the decision until the next regularly scheduled COA meeting
  - Between the two meetings, the COA will direct staff to send out a mini-team to confirm the findings of the site review team
  - Between the two meetings, the institution prepares a rejoinder\* that they may choose to present at next meeting, either in person or through videoconferencing
  - At the next regularly scheduled meeting of the COA, the initial decision to deny accreditation is revisited (confirmation or denial) and becomes final

Gay Roby 4/13/12 2:58 PM

**Comment:** (would this now be true of a revisit decision as well?)

\* it was noted that the COA would need to define what constitutes a successful rejoinder

- at that time
  - Should the determination be Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations, the stipulations could be created at that time
- As an alternative to the post-review team protocol, an institution, through its work with and the aid of, their assigned state consultant, may ask for a pre-visit or a postponement of their site visit for a pre-determined number of months for the express purpose of correcting an egregious implementation component.

#### **Definition of a Rejoinder**

Should the COA adopt a protocol that includes a rejoinder by the institution, the following points were noted as components/parameters of that rejoinder:

- The rejoinder might be limited to documentation that the institution had in their possession at the time of the visit, that might have influenced the site visit team's recommendation
- The rejoinder must show that the site visit team was factually incorrect
- The rejoinder must not be a successful argument mounted in opinion

#### **Next Steps**

Based on the COA's discussion and revision of the draft language presented at this meeting, staff will prepare an action item for the May COA meeting.